DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 930 EA 008 076

AUTHOR Hall, Mary; Hall, William T.
TITLE Great Expectations: Contemporary Statewide Schooling Reform and Some Victorian Antecendents.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; *Educational Change; *Educational History; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Performance Based Education; State Departments of Education; *State Programs; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon

ABSTRACT

Between 1972 and 1974, Oregon adopted a series of comprehensive State Minimum Standards popularly titled "competency-based education." This paper addresses two types of research agendas that have emerged relative to these attempts to create a statewide reform. The first involves an ongoing research project whose purpose is to facilitate the implementation and examination of major demands imposed on schools by these policies. The second agenda relates to areas of potential, but unimplemented, research such as (1) an investigation of why state bodies appear to be a contemporary focus for major educational reforms; (2) a review of educational reforms in Victorian England, which appear to be somewhat similar to the Oregon effort, as a vehicle for using historical perspectives in building new conceptual frameworks for viewing competency-based education; and (3) an analysis of interrelationships between competency-based education reform in elementary/secondary education and similar reforms occurring in the preparation of educational personnel by postsecondary institutions. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED120930

GREAT EXPECTATIONS: CONTEMPORARY STATEWIDE SCHOOLING REFORM AND SOME VICTORIAN ANTECEDENTS

By Mary Hall, Associate Superintendent,
Oregon State Department of Education

and

William T. Hall, Assistant Professor
of History, Oregon State University

Symposium on Research as a Tool in Facilitating and Assessing Statewide School Reform Policies,
1976 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California

EA 008 076

INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1970's, state agencies in Oregon have adopted a series of statewide policies which provide the legal basis for moving Oregon public elementary and secondary schools and post secondary institutions preparing school personnel toward a philosophical and methodological orientation which has popularly become known as "competency-based education "

These policy areas have dealt with changes in three areas:

- Minimum requirements for graduation from high schools;
- Standards upon which personnel preparation institutions are accredited and educational personnel are certified; and,
- Minimum school standards used by the state to accredit elementary and secondary schools and thus make them eligible for state financial support.

The content and descriptions of the development of these policies have been documented elsewhere (Oliver, 1974; Fairbanks, 1975; Hall, 1975; and Spady, 1975). This paper will not elaborate issues covered in these earlier writings.

What is important to note, however, is that from a research perspective, the Oregon policies and the environment in which they were enacted offer some very interesting areas of

exploration. They also force a strong interrelationship between research and development and the effective implementation of such policies.

1) The policies call for a shift in the existing decision-making structure and, consequently, the focus of power and control in both schools and colleges.

2) The new regulations change the basis upon which the state evaluates schools and colleges from a prior preoccupation with the efficient and effective use of "inputs" to a new emphasis on the effectiveness and the value of "processes" and "outcomes."

3) Given a few general state guidelines, individual school districts and institutions of higher education have more or less been given complete freedom to devise their own responses to the new state requirements and to add additional local regulations if they wish.

4) Policies in all three areas have been adopted in a spirit of experimentalism with periodic reviews prescribed in the regulations.

Given these factors, Oregon policymakers are placing a major reliance on research and development to help refine,

implement and evaluate regulations which have far-reaching consequences for the entire publicly-funded educational system in the state. And given the degree of change in education potentially resulting from the regulations, the variation in responses being selected by various sites, the expected need for new and better technology, and the significance of the philosophical, political and economic questions associated with the Oregon policies, it is probably fair to say that right now Oregon is a researcher's paradise. Parenthetically, the James C. Blaine Society (a group dedicated to limiting population growth and environmental decay in Oregon) wishes to announce that "you can come to research, but not to reside." And you must be "pollution-free."

Thus far, two major agendas of research and development activities have emerged. The first might be classified as areas of investigation which the state knows must be undertaken and in which work is either completed or underway. The second agenda would loosely be described as problems which were identified, but on which substantive efforts have really not yet been initiated.

AGENDA ONE: Research and Development Underway

In the interests of time, remarks will be limited to research and development activities which have had or will have direct bearing on policy-making related to Oregon's new competency-based education requirements, and will be organized to briefly describe some of the work that has been done or is underway and its potential impact from the state's perspective.

Three empirically-based doctoral dissertations have been completed on aspects of the new high school graduate requirements. The first of these was completed in 1972 by Worrell, who examined attitudes of school staff, parents and students in a medium-sized school district in Oregon to determine desired graduation requirements. The major contribution of the Worrell study to policies being considered at that time was the finding that there appeared to be strong support for the move toward "competencies" as an addition to traditional graduation requirements. His research also tended to support recommendations that state curriculum requirements should be kept flexible so that local school districts could develop programs which would meet state regulations but also satisfy heterogeneous community values and capabilities.

A second study was completed in 1974 by Bierly. He undertook a content analysis of the several hundred competency statements adopted by four medium-to-large sized schools. His study was put to use in two respects. First, it provided the original definition of "competency-based education" which began to be used in state-issued literature to try to explain the type of reform we were after. Secondly, his findings showed that almost all of the districts had chosen different "minimum" competencies. The data was used to refute those who argued that the state should adopt a single statewide list of specific, well-defined competencies which all graduating seniors would have to complete. While this issue was largely a political one, those who were fighting for a single set of well-defined state-issued competencies had based their argument on the assumption that schools would adopt similar competency statements anyway. The Bierly study not only refuted this, but identified an interesting area of future policy research.

In the summer of 1975, Bayley completed research on eighteen school districts throughout Oregon to determine teacher's attitudes toward their experience in initiating the new competency-based program for ninth graders. His study was designed to determine (1) what potential existed for instituting the requisite

instructional program? (2) what morale factors needed to be considered? and (3) what staff development provisions needed to be arranged?

While his finding indicated that the majority of teachers (60.4 percent) were in favor of the new requirements, he determined that much of their support for the program was based on the clarity it brought to local role expectations for teachers. He also identified a number of process variables which appeared to determine the degree to which districts had successfully moved ahead with their programs, and he suggested a variety of future research, development and training activities--most of which were given serious consideration in the design of upcoming projects.

Also in 1975, the Oregon Department of Education initiated a research project which resulted in (1) a model for analyzing the content of the new Minimum School Standards to show the intended interrelationships between the various sections and to identify areas of ambiguity, duplication or omission; (2) the identification of critical competencies needed by school districts to implement the major instruction-related aspects of the Standards, and (3) data collection on competencies where priority should be

placed in immediate in-service training programs for classroom teachers (Hall, 1976). The data from this study is currently in use as the state reviews potential changes in the Minimum School Standards and as universities and colleges begin to analyze their curriculums in relation to the public school requirements.

While these earlier works were of use, none of them were of sufficient scope or sophistication to address the range of research and development issues which have been identified by the Oregon Department of Education and others during the preceding two years.

Limiting the discussion now to issues related to the new State Minimum Standards for students and schools and being somewhat arbitrary in the selection of important issues, let us provide an overview of examples of the kinds of questions state policymakers wanted answered.

1) Just what was this thing Oregon was calling competency-based education? What were its major characteristics? How did it compare to the earlier movement in higher education? How did it differ from traditional education? And how did the requirements adopted thus far in Oregon relate to characteristics of a reform called competency-based education?

2) What were the major philosophical assumptions behind competency-based education, especially in terms of relationships to the roles and purposes of education, the

learning and teaching processes, the environment in schools, essential technologies, and relationships between students, staff, the community and the state?

3) Given the goals and competencies already adopted at the state level and currently under adoption at the local level, what would be the impact of the full implementation of competency-based education on students? On their knowledges, skills, abilities, values, choices, attitudes and so forth? And how would students going through competency-based education programs differ from those graduated from other types of educational programs?

4) What would be the impact of competency-based education on the community, the school and the school staff? State leaders were especially concerned about things such as values, educational priorities, authority and decision-making structures, incentive and rewards systems, the allocation of resources, staff capabilities, roles and relationships, and the interrelationship between choices of student outcomes, curriculum design and student certification. Would these impacts be positive or negative given the philosophical values of policymakers who had established the new regulations and the many other audiences concerned with education in Oregon?

5) What was the state-of-the-art in terms of the technology needed to implement competency-based education and where should the highest priority be placed in terms of research and development? Again, the state was particularly concerned with the decision of whether to concentrate on planning, measurement and record-keeping technologies or to worry first about technology related to the actual act of instruction?

6) In terms of responding to requests for policy guidance from other states, what could Oregon eventually say about the problems and successes encountered in implementing CBE and what should be the recommendations

to a national audience about replicating our regulations or similar approaches?

It was obvious that resources would not be available in Oregon at either the state or local level to adequately develop answers to these questions. And so, in cooperation with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory and a consortia of schools, universities and other organizations in Oregon, the state received support for a multi-year project from the National Institute of Education which began in December of 1975.

The first five months of this project have largely been spent in planning and in the development of conceptual papers to help clarify the state-of-the-art and the complexity of some of the questions outlined earlier (and many which were not mentioned). The program staff is currently in negotiation with NIE concerning specific design plans for research in policy, implementation, development and outcome areas, so it would be premature to speak to the specific areas of research to be covered by this award. But four points are important to the purpose of this symposium:

1) The state made a conscious decision to locate the project in an agency other than the Oregon Department

of Education in order to enhance both the research freedom of the program and to also give a clear signal that while the results of the program were expected to be of help with the Oregon regulations, it recognized that the questions which must be dealt with had regional and national implications.

2) The program planners developed an administrative structure for the grant which enhances an extremely close tie between the so-called "practioner" audience in education and the traditional "research and development" audience. Representatives of these two groups are working together on these problems as colleagues, and this is one of the unique aspects of the program and one of its inherent strengths. It also insures that the results of the project will have immediate and direct impact on both state and local policymakers and on our implementation efforts. It also insures that as schools encounter new problems and questions relative to the state regulations and their implementation these can be immediately fed back to the R & D project.

3) Even though the work thus far has largely been of a conceptual nature, these working papers and so-called "think pieces" have already had substantive impact on the Department. The work thus far has made the Department of Education even more aware of the fact that there is no single approach to competency-based education and that Oregon is potentially dealing with a much more powerful, sophisticated and complex reform than perhaps was earlier envisioned.

4) And finally, these papers and discussions generated largely through the availability of the NIE resources have, coupled with insights gained through earlier studies, played a major role in the current review and revision we are making in these Minimum Standards. Many of these changes will have little impact on the students graduating in 1978 since the state department felt it was unfair to the schools to make drastic changes in the regulations at this time. But we predict that you're going to see a much better set of state regulations effective for the graduating class of 1981.

AGENDA TWO: Research for the Future

We may be somewhat presumptive to limit suggested areas of future research to only three topics since undoubtedly a variety of research areas will emerge from both the NIE project and the studies underway in the Oregon Department of Education and elsewhere. If the mark of good research is that it prompts more questions than it answers, then we can guarantee that the research activities currently underway will provide interesting and relevant areas of studies for years to come. Given this cautionary note, however, let us mention three areas of research which the Oregon Department of Education policymakers hope to see initiated at some point in the near future.

- The first deals with interests in the historical antecedents of competency-based education and the concern that investigations in this area are needed to insure that our current framework for research is as comprehensive and insightful as possible.

When asked to justify the utility of historical research, the professional historian is tempted to remark that such research is self-justifying because it is interesting in and of itself. Too frequently this remark ends the conversation. It ought simply to

change the question to "what is interesting about a given area of historical research?" A variety of answers may be forthcoming, but one seems especially appropriate to an audience of professional educators and researchers confronted with a contemporary reform of the dimensions of competency-based education. An historical perspective quite often will provide a clearer view of the ramifications of a particular reform than is found through reliance on the methodology of inquiry in other academic disciplines. Clarity of this sort may be no substitute for a solution to the present dilemma, but a solution may be more wisely developed in the light of an historical perspective which tutors the mind to seek out origins, ends and contexts, as well as the processes and methods of reform. And, in addition to the special contribution of a different type of framework for reviewing the reform, the historian finds that few contemporary changes in American education are without some pertinent historical antecedents. These antecedents, occasionally well-documented, can suggest specific questions which should be included in a contemporary research framework. The current reformer or researcher, by contrast, has only hypotheses and conjectures confined to the present with which to work. The "history" of his

or her particular effort to change education is still largely unknown.

The method of inquiry that appeals to the historian emphasizes a comprehensive view. The questions which an historian finds interesting about a reform in the past, for example, include:

1) What are the theoretical and philosophical origins or beliefs underlying a particular reform? What is the conception of human nature manifest in the announced purpose of a reform? Is the reform dependent on rationality, self-interest, depravity, equality or what?

2) What is the belief concerning the way human beings learn, i.e., the debate between the influence of the environment versus the existence of innate ideas or forms in the mind?

3) What is the role of government in the reform? What economic, religious, political or philosophical issues are shaping this role?

4) Is there an end or goal for humanity implicit or explicit in the reform? Or does the reform attempt to remove artificial impediments to goals which are left to the discretion of the individual?

Given all of these questions, the historian is perhaps uniquely impressed with the importance of the historical context in making or breaking, so to speak, a particular reform. Perfectly reasonable reforms may get nowhere in one generation and flourish in another. Quite absurd reforms may remain active far

longer than any rational person might expect. Moreover, bits and pieces of reforms may hang on after their origins have been forgotten or discounted.

And there is always the suspicion active in the historian's mind that things are never what they seem--for historians are only able to review the past from a vantage point in the present. Records are frequently incomplete and often biased, and a mind schooled in one era may overlook the obvious in another. So at best the historical perspective provides one with a sense of bemusement about how the best laid plans for reform seldom work as intended. Considering the mental health of contemporary educational reformers, perhaps it is best that historians are generally confined to institutions of higher education where their muddlings and private humors are of less bother or are entertaining to only a small audience.

Given these preliminary remarks into the peculiarities of the historians' world, however, this aspect of the paper will attempt to show how the application of the historical perspective provides an interesting framework for viewing competency-based education, a reform which appears to be manifesting itself in many aspects of education even outside of Oregon. For this

particular reform there exists an historical antecedent in the mid-1800's in England. A quick retelling of this tale, with an eye to the historian's questions, may offer a new perspective for contemporary research in this area.

The story opens with the efforts of one Robert Lowe, who in 1862 was head of the English version of our departments of education. He administered for Parliament an educational system which was neither national in scope nor uniform in application. A hodgepodge of special grants, subsidies and standards were chiefly united through the efforts of Her Majesty's Inspectorate which reported to Parliament via Lowe.

Lowe found this situation inefficient and the reports of Inspectors subjective. Neither the former nor the latter seemed sufficient to justify public expense, and behind Lowe stood an economy-minded government trying to retrench on the expense of ruling a troublesome empire. Attempting to remedy the faults of English education and also respond positively to the government's desire to reduce expense, Lowe proposed a revision of the contemporary code of educational regulations which he said would substitute a "definite, clear and precise test" for the current ambiguous regulations "so that the public may know exactly what

consideration they get for their money" (Connell, 1950, p. 207). He also assured Parliament that public money would become both a "spur to improvement" and a "motive to action." Indeed, he had "the greatest hopes of the improved prospects of education, if this principle is sanctioned" (Adamson, 1930, p. 230).

Prompted by visions of economy and efficiency, Lowe developed a revision of the English code on the basis of principles generally associated with a social and political theory called Utilitarianism.

Advocated in the earlier nineteenth century by Jeremy Bentham, Utilitarianism became popular as a spur to the traditional establishment of England which had shown little inclination to adjust positively to the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, or the Industrial Revolution. Bentham was confident that England's social and political problems could be solved by following the principles of utility. The foundation of this principle was the assumption that avoidance of pain and achievement of pleasure was the basic human impulse. Government must accept the pain-pleasure thesis as its guide and test every law and institution for its utility in maximizing pleasure. Bentham developed a "felicific" or "moral calculus" to reduce this test to a simple

and uniform process. Application of the calculus made legislative action an explicit and objective matter of arithmetic which would also restrict legislation to a minimum which was assumed desirable for the public good.

By the 1860's, however, the principle of utility and the felicific calculus had lost their foundation in some bitter philosophical controversy, and the historical context in which Utilitarianism seemed such good sense had become an industrialized society. Explicitness, objectivity and uniformity remained popular as criteria for legislation, however, notwithstanding their rootlessness with respect to their original historical and philosophical base. In addition, the prospect of minimal government interference, its popularity buttressed by laissez-faire economics, was still associated with these criteria.

Oblivious to the philosophical controversy and the changed historical context, Lowe's "Revised Code" emerged in 1862. There are several parallels in the Code to the recent competency-based educational reforms in Oregon. For example:

- The "Code" provided explicit and public minimum standards for all schools who sought governmental fiscal subsidy. However, local schools were allowed to expand

curriculum requirements if local resources and parental preferences permitted.

- The standards were intended to insure that all students were given the opportunity to achieve a "minimum" education in the basics of reading, writing and arithmetic "in such a manner as will really enable them to employ these attainments in the practical business of life."
- The standards set forth specific "competencies" which students were expected to master and to demonstrate on objective and uniform examinations. For example, one such competency in writing called for students to: "Form on blackboard or slate, from dictation, letters, capital and small manuscript" (Maclure, 1965).

However, the "Revised Code" differed from the Oregon requirements in at least two major respects. These included:

- Teachers were held personally accountable for the performance of their students. In fact, teachers were paid according to the results of their students on the objective examinations (the pain-pleasure thesis is latent here in both the objective examinations and the accountability of payment by result).

- Certification of a student's completion of the standards was not delegated to the local schools, but was determined by "Her Majesty's Inspectors" using testing devices developed by an agency similar to current state departments of education.

For the next 30 years in England, this Code, frequently amended, shaped the major content and operation of publicly financed education. However, criticism of the Code began even before it was out of Parliament. Unavailing though it was at the time, the prophecy of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, the architect of the old system (Ball, 1964), that the Code would result in a mechanizing of teaching around a narrowing of the curriculum and a subversion of the training of teachers, appeared to come true. Much of the documentation of this judgment came from the writings of Matthew Arnold, one of Her Majesty's Inspectors and a poet and literary critic of growing fame. He observed the impact of the Code firsthand during most of its 30-year tenure. Arnold took early exception to the Code's "minimum-skills approach" and its reliance on uniform and objective outcomes to justify public fiscal support. He felt the state should not look to the basic skills alone, but must assume no less a role than that

of a civilizer of English youth. Rather than providing support for the improvement of the whole child, Arnold saw the Code supporting a sterilized collection of demonstrable skills. This would certainly reduce expense, but in the process, the working classes of England, for whom this support was chiefly intended, were to be left adrift in barbaric isolation which was wasteful and dangerous. He offered instead, a more comprehensive education which rather than simply enabling students to survive, would allow them to survive in a manner appropriate to a human being. He described the desirable type of education as one which resulted in ". . . the animation of mind, multiplying of ideas, the promptness to connect, in the thoughts, one thing with another . . ." (Smith and Summerfield, 1969). Objective tests were necessary, he conceded, but subjective evaluation by liberally educated Inspectors should be given greater weight in judging education.

Under the Code, dependence on minimal objective outcomes proved to have negative consequences for the curriculum, the teacher, and the relationship between the schools and the state. Arnold filed report after report documenting his objections between 1863 and his resignation from the Inspectorate in 1886. These are excerpted in Smith and Summerfield (1969). In brief,

his observations were as follows:

- He reported that "by laying down to the very letter the requirements which shall be satisfied in order to earn grants, the teacher, in consequence, is led to think not about teaching his subject, but about managing to hit those requirements." The result, according to Arnold, was a narrowing and weakening of the curriculum and a dependence on learning by rote.
- Arnold observed that the profession of teaching was reduced in esteem and deprived of spirit by the same narrowness and sterility affecting the pupils. He claimed that the new regulations mutated the teacher's role to that of a factory manager confined to the manufacturing of a simple, explicit product. He reported that as a result, English teacher colleges turned out nearly 60 percent fewer teachers in 1866 than in 1861, although the school population had increased by several hundred thousand.
- He charged that the Code had eroded cooperation between teachers and the state. The Code forced the Inspectors to deal with administrators of schools, rather

than the teachers. And the tying of requirements to salaries produced "sharp practices" among teachers who used their initiative to seek "mechanical contrivances" to "beat" a mechanical Code, rather than to stimulate learning.

Lastly, Arnold reported that the Code had increased the paperwork of the Inspectors to such an extent that they were turning into bureaucratic accountants with little or no time to attend to regulations other than the three examinations required of each student each year. In 1868, for example, Arnold examined some 13,000 students. The thousands of examinations this represented forced into the background his desire for a collegial and helpful relationship with teachers and also the more usual inspection of buildings, libraries and other areas where schools were expected to conform to government standards.

By the 1890's, the two major principles of "payment by results" and the focus on a few "minimum skills" had been eliminated from the Code. A combination of political and educational factors contributed to this demise.

- An enlarged electorate demanded additional support for an expanded curriculum which would insure the working

classes a broader education.

- The technology chosen for implementation of the Code, i.e., the specification of explicit, uniform and objective criteria evaluated through three examinations a year for each student was an obstacle to education. In fact, one of Arnold's most pertinent observations was that the examination process tended to drive the curriculum, rather than respond to it. Areas which would not be easily assessed were discounted or discarded.
- Lowe's great expectation for economy, efficiency and educational improvement had boiled down simply to "cheapness." In spite of the fact that Lowe used only the residual elements of Utilitarianism, it appeared that these apparently straightforward and still popular criteria had, latent within them, the narrow and materialistic flavor of the original theory. Once a positive social and political influence when counterbalanced by the diffuse nature of traditional England, Utilitarianism was an inadequate basis for the public support of the whole of elementary education in another and different historical context. Were the events

surrounding the Revised Code less cluttered with other factors, one might say that the merit of Bentham's principle of utility was finally and definitely disproved.

This brief summary of the content and the consequences of an earlier and extreme attempt at accountability in education, and the use of minimum objective criteria or competencies for the content of education, bears too many resemblances to the Oregon program and to educational and finance reforms being proposed in other states to discount as simply "an interesting story." And it is the feeling of policymakers in key roles in Oregon that a more thorough examination of this and similar antecedents should be completed, not only for their contribution to the research framework of current reforms, but for their potential lessons in terms of emerging policy deicisons.

- A second unfilfilled research agenda in Oregon deals with the interrelationships between the competency-based education movement in elementary and secondary schools and a similar movement now underway nationally in educational personnel preparation programs.

To paraphrase Edelfelt (1975), the purpose of such programs (whether preservice or in-service) "should . . . be . . . in the final analysis, to have an impact on the quality of school programs for students" (p. 1).

Schalock (1972) suggested that given this viewpoint, personnel preparation programs must be founded in an understanding of the outcomes desired for elementary and secondary students and the processes and environments in schools necessary to see that such outcomes are achieved. A variety of research questions are thus prompted by this concern.

1) How do we build effective models for tying desired outcomes in elementary and secondary schools to personnel preparation programs which must serve diverse geographic areas when undoubtedly such outcomes are going to differ from one school site to another?
2) How do we translate the chosen processes and environments in diverse schools into competencies for school personnel?
3) How do we define appropriate relationships between such competencies and the roles of various categories of school staffs?

4) How do we really identify the appropriate cause and effect relationships between school processes, environments, personnel behavior and student outcomes (whether cognitive or otherwise) to be sure that personnel preparation programs are grounded in good theory and research?

There are a variety of other dimensions to this issue, but these questions provide the flavor for the types of questions Oregon is asking and those which hopefully will eventually be dealt with through effective research and development efforts. The necessity for tying together the state's personnel preparation programs and the purposes of public schooling in Oregon is a critical agenda.

- Finally, Oregon policymakers are interested in research as to why contemporary reform movements appear to be spearheaded by state-level commissions, boards and agencies.

It appears that in past times, educational changes and innovations have more frequently been generated by the federal government (with its relatively large research, development and

experimental resources) and the so-called "light-house-school-districts" (with their exceptional leaders and staff and a size more appropriate for the management of significant reform).

In the 1970's, however, the torch for educational reform has, in many parts of the country, been passed to state departments of education or similar state-level bodies. If this is an appropriate and valid observation (which may well be an interesting area of inquiry), then several other questions or issues must be answered:

1) Why did this change occur? And especially, what are the characteristics of those state agencies in locales where this new leadership in educational reform developed?
2) What are the implications of this issue for state agency organization, staffing, financing and relationships to national and local educational agencies?
3) If essential characteristics related to organization, staffing, financing and relationships are not effected or sustained, what type or level of educational agency can next be expected to assume major leadership for educational reform?

And we suppose the final question to be asked is the very one we opened with: If educational reform at the state level is to continue to flourish and to result in improved schooling, then how can we build new and better relationships between these state agencies and the research and development community to make certain that a new and effective partnership is forged which is not solely dependent upon the availability of periodic grants? How do we truly define and sustain an appropriate role for research in facilitating and assessing statewide school reform?

REFERENCE LIST

Adamson, J. W. English Education: 1789-1902. London: Cambridge University Press, 1930.

Ball, N. Her Majesty's Inspectorate: 1839-1849. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1964.

Bayley, E. R. Perceptions of Ninth Grade Teachers in Selected Schools Regarding Revised Oregon School Graduation Requirements During the First Year of Implementation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1975.

Bierly, K. W. A Content Analysis of Competency Statements Contained in Requirements for School Graduation in Selected Innovative Public School Districts in Oregon. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1974.

Connell, W. F. The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960.

Edelfelt, R. A. The Shifting Emphasis of Teacher Education from Pre-service to In-service. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Fairbanks, D. W. Competency-based Education in Oregon. Unpublished manuscript. Salem: Competency-based Education Program, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1975.

Hall, M. Competency-Based Education in Oregon: An Overview. Washington, D. C.: Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1975.

Hall, M. Competencies Needed by School Districts to Implement Instructional Portions of Oregon's New Minimum School Standards: Critique Draft. Unpublished manuscript. Salem: Oregon State Department of Education, 1976.

Maclure, J.S. Educational Documents: England and Wales 1816-1963. London: Chapman and Hall, 1965.

Oliver, G. School Graduation Requirements in Oregon: A Discussion of the Events Surrounding the 1972 Change in Requirements. Unpublished manuscript. Salem: Oregon State Department of Education, 1974.

Schalock, H.D. BEPC, NCERD, and Teacher Education That Makes a Demonstrable Difference. In B. Rosner (Ed.), The Power of Competency-based Teacher Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Smith, P. & Summerfield, G. Matthew Arnold and the Education of the New Order. London: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Spady, W.G. Critical Sociological Dimensions of Competency-Based Graduation Requirements. Washington, D.C.: Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1975.

Worrell, W.K. High School Graduation Requirements as Perceived by Professional Staff, Parents and Students of a Middle-Sized School District. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1972.